

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Prior to the entry of this Amendment, claims 1, 7, 9-14, 16, 20-25, 27, 31-36, 38, 39, 41-44, 46-49, and 51-57 were pending in this application. Claims 1, 9, 16, 21, 27, and 32 have been amended, claims 38, 39, 41-44, 46-49, 51, and 52 have been canceled, and no claims have been added herein. Therefore, claims 1, 7, 9-14, 16, 20-25, 27, 31-36, and 53-57 are now pending in this application. Support for these amendments can be found, for example, in FIG. 20 and the related description beginning at page 46 of the pending application. Applicants request reconsideration of these claims for at least the reasons presented below.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection, Hardy in view of Fox

The Office Action has rejected claims 1, 7, 9-14, 16, 20-25, 27, 31-36, 38, 39, 41-44, 46-49, and 51-57 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,073,242 to Hardy et al. (hereinafter “Hardy”), and further in view of U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2005/0138363 of Fox et al. (hereinafter “Fox”). The Applicants respectfully submit that the Office Action does not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness in rejecting these claims, as amended. Therefore, the Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

In order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, all claimed limitations must first be taught or suggested by the prior art. See, e.g., *DyStar Textilfarben GmbH & Co. Deutschland KG v. C.H. Patrick Co.*, 464 F.3d 1356, 1360 (Fed. Cir. 2006). The Office Action must then provide an explicit analysis supporting the rejection. See *KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 127 S. Ct. 1727, 1741 (2007) (“a patent composed of several elements is not proved obvious merely by demonstrating that each of its elements was, independently, known in the prior art”). While the Office Action can use one of several exemplary rationales from the MPEP to support an obviousness rejection under *KSR*, all the rationales still require the Office Action to demonstrate that all the claim elements are shown in the prior art. See MPEP §2143. As will be

discussed below, the references cited by the Office Action do not teach or suggest each claimed limitation.

As discussed previously, Hardy is directed to “an authority server that supports the implementation of role-based enterprise policies for expressing and exercising authority and the projection and transfer of those authorities over networks of communicating electronic systems.” (Col. 3, line 23-27) Under Hardy, “the authority server exclusively embodies the authorities of the enterprise and allows its users to indirectly wield those authorities only as permitted by enterprise policies.” (Col. 3, lines 28-31) That is, Hardy describes issuing representations of authority based on application of enterprise policies. See generally col. 3, line 23 – col. 4, line 51.

However and as noted previously, Hardy fails to teach or suggest a first workflow which calls for obtaining an approval before performing a certificate related action for users having a first user type and a second workflow which does not call for obtaining an approval before performing a certificate related action for users having a second user type. Hardy also fails to teach or suggest such an entity identified in a user profile for the user. Hardy does not teach or suggest one of the workflows requiring approval for a certificate action while another does not. That is, Hardy does not teach or suggest selecting workflows that handle certificate related requests differently, i.e., requiring or not requiring approval from an entity associated with a requesting user, based on the type of user requesting the action. Rather, Hardy describes issuing representations of authority based on a set of enterprise policies but without mentioning obtaining approval from an entity associated with the requestor, identified in an identity profile for the requestor or otherwise.

Further still, Hardy does not teach or suggest selecting between workflows for performing such certificate related actions based on a domain to which a user may belong, an action requested and a user type from an identity profile that is identified in the request for the

certificate related action. In other words, Hardy does not teach or suggest determining from a plurality of domains a domain that includes a user, determining from the plurality of workflows, one or more workflows associated with the domain and capable of performing the certificate related action, retrieving from the one or more workflows associated with the domain a first workflow for responding to the request, wherein retrieving the first workflow comprises selecting the first workflow from the one or more workflows associated with the domain based on the first certificate related action and a user type of the first user from a set of characteristics for the first user from an identity profile for the first user maintained by the Identity System and indicated in the request for the certificate related action as recited in the pending claims.

Fox is directed to “a method and system for using a certificate authority to first provide a customer with a digital certificate, and then having a relying third party who receives that digital certificate from the customer access a status authority (the certificate authority or a designated agent of the certificate authority) to receive a second, reissued digital certificate on the first digital certificate or its public key.” (paragraph 7) However, Fox does not teach or suggest, alone or in combination with Hardy, determining from a plurality of domains a domain that includes a user, determining from the plurality of workflows, one or more workflows associated with the domain and capable of performing the certificate related action, retrieving from the one or more workflows associated with the domain a first workflow for responding to the request, wherein retrieving the first workflow comprises selecting the first workflow from the one or more workflows associated with the domain based on the first certificate related action and a user type of the first user from a set of characteristics for the first user from an identity profile for the first user maintained by the Identity System and indicated in the request for the certificate related action. Rather, Fox like Hardy seems to be silent with regard to selection of workflows based on a domain to which user belongs.

Claim 1, upon which claims 2-15, 54, and 55 depend, claim 16, upon which claims 17-26 and 56 depend, and claim 27, upon which claims 28-37 and 57 depend, each recite

in part “associating each workflow of a plurality of workflows with a corresponding domain of a plurality of domains in an Identity System, each domain of said plurality of domains comprising one or more entities and each workflow of said plurality of workflows using a different predefined set of steps to perform a certificate related action wherein each workflow in said plurality of workflows corresponds to a different set of characteristics for a user, wherein the first workflow contains a first set of steps and a second workflow in said plurality of workflows contains a second set of steps, wherein said first set of steps is different from said second set of steps, wherein said first workflow calls for obtaining an approval before performing a certificate related action for users having a first user type, and wherein said second workflow does not call for obtaining an approval before performing a certificate related action for users having a second user type; receiving at the Identity System a request for a first certificate related action for a first user wherein the first certificate related action is selected from a group consisting of a certificate enrollment action, a certificate renewal action, and a certificate revocation action; determining from said plurality of domains a domain that includes said user; determining from said plurality of workflows, one or more workflows associated with said domain and capable of performing said certificate related action; retrieving by the Identity System from said one or more workflows associated with said domain a first workflow for responding to said request, wherein retrieving the first workflow comprises selecting the first workflow from the one or more workflows associated with said domain based on the first certificate related action and a user type of the first user from a set of characteristics for the first user from an identity profile for the first user maintained by the Identity System being the first user type and wherein the request includes an identification of said identity profile for the first user; [and] performing said first workflow, wherein performing said first workflow comprises executing said predefined set of steps of said first workflow to perform said certificate related action including retrieving an approval response from an entity associated with the first user and identified in the identity profile for the first user and obtaining a certificate and a real time status for the certificate from a certificate authority based on the approval response.” Hardy and Fox do not teach or suggest, alone or in combination, determining from a plurality of domains a domain that includes a user, determining

from the plurality of workflows, one or more workflows associated with the domain and capable of performing the certificate related action, retrieving from the one or more workflows associated with the domain a first workflow for responding to the request, wherein retrieving the first workflow comprises selecting the first workflow from the one or more workflows associated with the domain based on the first certificate related action and a user type of the first user from a set of characteristics for the first user from an identity profile for the first user maintained by the Identity System and indicated in the request for the certificate related action. For at least these reasons, the Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance and an action to that end is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 303-571-4000.

Respectfully submitted,

/William J. Daley/
William J. Daley
Reg. No. 52,471

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 303-571-4000 (Denver office)
Fax: 303-571-4321 (Denver office)
WJD:jep

62816452 v1